

George Jarvis (J).. Austin, esq. (TBA) 12/31/20
Austin v. TESLA, et. al. Case #3:20-cv-00800
240 E. Channel St. #1354 Stockton, CA 95202
2107 Montauban Ct. Stockton, CA 95210

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE J. AUSTIN, Plaintiff,

NOTICE

Re: Dkt. Nos. 67-80

v.

TESLA., et al., Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00800

George Jarvis (J).. Austin, esq. (TBA) 12/31/20
Austin v. TESLA, et. al. Case #3:20-cv-00800
240 E. Channel St. #1354 Stockton, CA 95202
2107 Montauban Ct. Stockton, CA 95210

Pursuant to Honorable Judge Chen's Order, Plaintiff acknowledges Judge Chen's Order, and his ruling that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint has surpassed *Twombly* and *Iqbal* standards (as made reference to in Order). Defendant counsel has yet to assert any Defense, Affirmative or otherwise beyond what Judge Chen has already, asked, and ruled upon in the initial ruling, and its related causes of action (whereas all causes of action in Amended Complaint surpassed Judicial Review). Further, Plaintiff's pre-discovery disclosures are simply designed to highlight the already pleaded, Judicial Reviewed, and surpassed, facts and causes of action (Defamation destroying, and surpassing, any (not yet asserted affirmative defense of) qualified privilege, Federal and State Labor Code Violations (based on Plaintiff discovered Defendant underpayment of approximately, at minimum, \$25,000.00), Conversion of specific amount of predefined amount of Plaintiff's money, of wages already being paid (in a specific account, in Plaintiff's name, and Social Security number, and checks, etc), in accord with California's Supreme Court's ruling, Breach of Contract, Fraudulent Omission, and Misrepresentation(s), Tortious Interference with Economic Advantage, Wrongful Discharge, and Whistleblower Retaliation). At hearing questions were asked relating Judicial Reviewed, and surpassed, causes of action by Honorable Judge Chen, and Defense Counsel, at hearing (67-80). They are not additional briefs, pleadings, but exhibits, and highlighted facts, corresponding to the response, and highlighted facts, already surpassing Judicial Review to clarify any questions asked, and support the ruling of already passed Judicial review, and its related causes of action. Pursuant to Honorable Judge Chen's Ruling of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, surpassing *Twombly and Iqbal* Standards, and Judicial Review, Defense's Non-Assertion of Any Defenses beyond any questions already answered, and surpassed by

George Jarvis (J).. Austin, esq. (TBA) 12/31/20
Austin v. TESLA, et. al. Case #3:20-cv-00800
240 E. Channel St. #1354 Stockton, CA 95202
2107 Montauban Ct. Stockton, CA 95210

Honorable Judge Chen's Ruling, and Rule 26 *Duty to Disclose; General Provisions Governing*

Discovery, Rule 56(c), and Rule 44 *Proving an Official Record*, Plaintiff moves to file Notice of material facts, and contextual information undergirding the complaint and Defendant's violations of Plaintiffs rights. Plaintiff shall file (and has filed) a series of notices, and affidavits, providing appropriate context for pleadings, and forthcoming filings (and ultimate victory).

Plaintiff, (University of California, Berkeley Graduate (09'), Honors Student, Bay Area Housing Commissioner, Alum, NAACP National Representative, and Local Youth and College President, Alum, California Senate, Capital Fellows, Senate Fellows Top 10 out of 800+ Nationally Ranked, Alum (13'), UCLA Law, and Anderson Riordan MBA Fellows, Alum (08',13'), T-14 Law Student, as well as others), and Attorney of Record, Mr. George Jarvis (J.) Austin, esq. (TBA) has also tried repeatedly to resolve the issue outside of litigation, but no amenable option, or alternative, was provided by Defendants. Specifically, Plaintiff exhausted pre-litigation options to try and solve the issue outside of court, avoid any unnecessary litigation, or causes of action, but Defendants refused, and further shut down healthy professional, proactive, communication.